

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
REPORT OF CONVERSATION Page 1 of 2

DOCKET 03-AFC-2
DATE MAR 23 2005
REGD MAR 25 2005

*Systems Assessment and
Facilities Siting Division*

FILE: 03-AFC-2

PROJECT TITLE: Los Esteros II, Phase 1

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephone	651-8853	<input type="checkbox"/> Meeting Location:	
NAME:	Robert Worl	DATE:	3/23/05
WITH:	William J. Garbett	TIME:	3:30-4:45 pm
SUBJECT:	Phase 1: CEC violated Brown Act, No Proj. Alt. inadequate-no closure plan; Phase 2: electrical interconnection, cooling method, public health		

COMMENTS:

Mr. Garbett called at approximately 3:30 pm to discuss some issues raised in his phone-in to the Business Meeting of 3-16 re LECEF, and a notice he received in the mail indicating that Phase 2 had also been approved.

Phase 1 issues:

1. CEC violated the Brown Act with its inadequate notification period for the Business Meeting consideration of Phase 1, [I responded with the CEC requirement of a "minimum of 10-days notice, and that the PMPD and the Business Meeting were noticed together, giving the proper time bw]
2. The Alternatives for Phase 1, specifically the "No Project" alt, was inadequate due to the failure to include a closure plan for the plant.
3. The CEC erred in not restating/reaffirming the 3-year time limitation on the conversion to combined-cycle, thus issuing a license for the life of the plant. [I stated that this was known, and was the intent; CEC believes that Calpine does plan the conversion, but expects the timing could be delayed due to market conditions. Bw]
4. Bicycle Path: The city (SJ) adopted responsibility for the bike paths (generally?) at a City Council meeting about 3 weeks ago. Calpine is shooting itself in the foot by not expressing its willingness to pay the full cost of the repair. This may be impacting their rezone application as well, losing them good will at the City.

Flooding Potential: The project environment, particularly the substations (SVP, PG&E) may be subject to flooding, 1988 and 1995 were two big events causing wide-spread flooding in the area. Putting the stormwater outfall through to Coyote Creek main channel could provide an avenue for flood water to back up.

Electrical Issues: 1. Project (both phases) should not be allowed to increase from 115 to 230 kV output due to shorting issues associated w/ SVP 230 kV lines.
2. Also, the new connection should be undergrounded to SVP, poles pose potential for raptor perches.
3. Calpine should run a fresh water line for toilets, etc. and this would also allow for fresh water being available to clean insulators subject to degradation from buildup from dust, cooling tower spray etc.

Gas Metering: For security and safety, the meter, now near 237, should be moved inside security fence. Current chainlink fence, no top, allows opportunity for sabotage.

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
REPORT OF CONVERSATION Page 2 of 2



Public Health Issues: I asked Mr. Garbett about the statements he made attributing a new strain of influenza-"California-A" to effects of cooling tower dispersion of bacteria from recycled water. He responded by saying there is no cause-effect documentation, other than careful observation of flu outbreaks associated within a short (two-week) period after commissioning and operation of new power plants using recycled water for cooling: examples began with San Jose State Univ. at 10th and San Carlos using recycled water through their cooling towers and a severe outbreak of flu. Same happened with early Cisco power plant on Tasmin Dr. also correlated with a severe outbreak of flu; same with LECEF, and with PICO startup. [A letter was sent requesting documentation of these outbreaks 3-22-05, and I asked him about his statements to the Business Meeting via phone. The above is his response, and he indicated he may not respond further to the letter. Bw]

Dry Cooling would be preferable, and practical at LECEF, especially for Phase 2.

PM-10 and PM-2.5: Electrostatic Collectors would be more effective and efficient than the SCR at eliminating impacts of fine particulate, and may be cost-effective as well. ECs would be far more effective for the fine particulate such as PM-2.5. Additionally, since this is a process which involves ionization at the stack output, it could possibly have additional beneficial impacts on the surrounding air quality.

cc: Project Staff	Signed: Robert Worl
	Name: Robert Worl